

378.05
A5
A86
cop. 2

VOLUME III

DECEMBER, 1917

NUMBER 8

BULLETIN

OF

**THE AMERICAN ASSOCIATION
OF UNIVERSITY PROFESSORS**

**ANNUAL MEETING
CHICAGO
DECEMBER 28, 29**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
General Announcements	
Annual Meeting	3
Constitutional Amendments	5
Report of Committee on Nominations	6
Notes from Local Branches	8
Notes from Committees	9
Report of Committee on Honorary Degrees	14
Report on Allegheny College	19
Secretary's Report	23
Nominations for Membership	25
Treasurer's Statement	27

galt
Phy. & C. C. Case
5-4-28

GENERAL ANNOUNCEMENTS

ANNUAL MEETING

The Program (revised) for the Annual Meeting is reprinted below:

Thursday, December 27

7.30 P. M. *Council Meeting.*

8.30 P. M. *Meetings of Committees A and P.*

Friday, December 28

9.00 A. M. *Meetings of Committees E, J, O, and T.*

Registration.

10.00 A. M.-12.00 M. *First Session.*

- (1) Adoption of Rules for Conduct of Business.
- (2) Reports from President, Secretary and Treasurer (November and December Bulletins).
- (3) Report of the Council.
- (4) Appointment of Committees on Resolutions and on Auditing.
- (5) Proposals of New Business for Reference to Committee on Resolutions.
- (6) Roll-call of Committees for Reports and Allotment of Time for Action on Those Requiring It.
- (7) Report of Committees L and M on Co-operation with Latin-American Universities and Recommendations of the Second Pan-American Scientific Congress (October Bulletin).

12.00 M. *Meeting of Committee on Resolutions.*

12.00 M.-2.00 P. M. *Informal Reception and Luncheon.*

2.00 P. M.-5.00 P. M. *Second Session.*

- (1) Report of Committee A on Academic Freedom and Academic Tenure.
- (2) Report of Committee P on Pensions and Insurance (November Bulletin).
- (3) Report of Nominating Committee and Election of Officers.

4.00 P. M., or at the close of the general session, *Meeting of Committee on Resolutions.*

7.00 P. M. *Informal Dinner.*

Saturday, December 29

9.00 A. M. *Meeting of the Council of 1917.*

10.00 A. M.-12.00 M. *Third Session.*

- (1) Report of Committee E on Qualifications for Membership.
- (2) Report of Committee J on Honorary Degrees (December Bulletin).
- (3) Discussion of President's Report.
- (4) Report of Committee on Resolutions.
- (5) Report of Auditing Committee.
- (6) Unfinished and Miscellaneous Business.
- (7) Appointment of Nominating Committee for 1918.

This session may, if needful, be continued Saturday at 2.00 P. M.

2.00 P. M., or at the close of the general session, *Meeting of the Council of 1918.*

Members are reminded of the desirability of bringing to the meeting copies of the BULLETIN containing reports and items of business which are to be discussed.

The following local committee has been appointed:

H. W. Prescott, Chicago; J. M. Coulter, Chicago; Henry Crew, Northwestern; F. S. Deibler, Northwestern; W. A. Locy, Northwestern; O. F. Long, Northwestern; A. A. Michelson, Chicago; E. H. Moore, Chicago; J. H. Tufts, Chicago; J. H. Wigmore, Northwestern.

Accommodations.—The Local Committee recommends the following hotels near the University of Chicago (European plan): *The Del Prado*, 59th Street (the Midway) between Blackstone and Dorchester Avenues, adjoining the grounds of the University. \$2 per day, with bath. *The Windermere*, 56th Street and Cornell Avenue. \$2.50 per day, with bath. *The Chicago Beach*, 51st Street and Cornell Avenue. \$2.50 and up per day, with bath.

The Del Prado is the most conveniently located; the other two are less accessible. It is desirable that reservations should be made in advance, either by direct communication with the hotels, or through H. W. Prescott (University of Chicago). The down-

town hotels are also available, and the University is easily reached from the city by express trains on the Suburban line of the Illinois Central (stations at Van Buren Street and at Randolph Street) to 57th Street; express trains, running three times an hour, make the trip in ten minutes.

Those who wish to obtain guest-cards at the University Club of Chicago should notify in advance E. H. Moore (University of Chicago).

Meals.—Lunches and dinners during the progress of the meetings will be supplied at the Quadrangle Club (58th Street and University Avenue), and the Council of the Club cordially extends the general privileges of the Club to members of the Association during the meetings.

Place of Meeting.—The headquarters of the Association will be the Reynolds Club, 57th Street and University Avenue.

Registration: Reynolds Club, first floor.

Committee Meetings: Reynolds Club, small rooms on second and third floors.

Meetings of the Association: Reynolds Club Theatre, third floor

CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENTS

The following amendment was recommended by the Council at the last annual meeting:

In Article III, section 4, add the sentence, "Ex-presidents of the Association shall be members of the Council ex-officio for the five years next succeeding their terms of office."

The following amendment presented at the last annual meeting was laid on the table:

In Article VII—Dues, change "\$2.00" to "\$2.50." This amendment was presented by the following members: A. O. Lovejoy, Johns Hopkins; J. C. Rolfe, Pennsylvania; H. W. Tyler, Massachusetts Institute of Technology; H. C. Warren, Princeton; E. A. Ross, Wisconsin.

The following amendments are presented by F. C. Woodward, Chairman of Committee E on Qualifications for Membership, J. Q. Dealey, Chairman of Committee F on Admissions, D. R. Dewey, H. P. Talbot, and H. W. Tyler, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

That *Article II, section 1*, be amended by inserting the words "or investigator" after the word "teacher" in the first line.

That *Article II* be amended by adding a third section, as follows:

3. *Any person who has been appointed to a full professorship after at least five years of active practice in the same field of learning and who has held such professorship for at least five years, and who in other respects fulfils the requirements of the first section of this article, may be nominated for membership in the Association.*

That *Article VIII* be amended so as to read as follows:

Article VIII—Honorary members: Termination of Membership.

1. *A member who becomes disqualified for active membership by becoming professor emeritus or by assuming duties wholly or mainly administrative may be elected by the Council to honorary membership.*

2. *Any other member who becomes ineligible by discontinuance of teaching or research may retain membership for not more than two years thereafter.*

3. *Non-payment of dues for two years shall terminate membership.*

4. *Honorary members shall be exempt from the payment of dues. They shall have the privilege of being present and speaking, but not of voting, at annual meetings.*

REPORT OF THE NOMINATING COMMITTEE

The Nominating Committee presents the following recommendations for officers for 1918:

For President, J. M. Coulter (Botany), University of Chicago.

For Vice-President, Roscoe Pound (Law), Harvard University.

For Treasurer, Harris Hancock (Mathematics), University of Cincinnati.

For Councillors (*for the term ending January 1, 1921*).

Carl Barus (Physics), Brown University.

H. A. Eaton (English), Syracuse University.

Elizabeth D. Hanscom (English), Smith College.

Ellen C. Hinsdale (German), Mount Holyoke College.

E. D. Starbuck (Philosophy), Iowa State University.

F. B. Dains (Chemistry), University of Kansas.

F. M. Fling (European History), University of Nebraska.

V. L. Kellogg (Zoölogy), Leland Stanford Jr. University.

H. Morse Stephens (History), University of California.

J. A. Smith (Political Science), University of Washington.

To fill the vacancy caused by the resignation of Prof. Walter Miller, of the University of Missouri, Edward Capps (Classics), Princeton.

Signed: E. G. Conklin (Princeton)

W. H. Hobbs (Michigan)

J. H. Latané (Johns Hopkins)

E. L. Nichols (Cornell)

Morris Jastrow, Jr. (Pennsylvania), *Chairman*

Nominating Committee.

The Committee on Nominations, whose formal report is reprinted above from the November BULLETIN, makes a supplementary statement in regard to precedence, which it is hoped may prove of value to future committees, as follows:

"The problem of making the proper selections to fill the annual vacancies in the Council is always the most difficult one confronting a nominating committee. In the constitution of the Council it is obvious that full consideration should be given to the three factors: (1) to geographical distribution; (2) to distribution according to subjects represented by the members of the Council; (3) to rotation of representation on the Council among the various institutions in the different sections of the country. With this in view the Committee entered into correspondence with the chairmen of local branches, covering, first, some of those institutions now represented by the retiring members of the Council, and second, about a dozen institutions having a considerable membership but which have not been as yet or are not at present represented in the Council. We asked these chairmen for suggestions, first, in regard to successors in case our Committee should decide to fill the vacancy by another representative from the same institution; second, for suggestions of candidates from institutions not at present represented in the Council. With these suggestions before us, and in most cases several names were submitted from each institution consulted, we proceeded to make a choice. We felt that in the case of the University of California and Leland Stanford University it would be desirable that representatives on the Council from these institutions should be continued; and we accordingly selected one candidate for each.

"The remaining eight candidates are from institutions that are not at present represented on the Council; and in the selection of the names we have been guided in part by recommendations sub-

mitted to us by the chairmen of the local branches, and in part by the wish to bring about an equitable distribution of subjects represented by the members of the Council.

"To fill the vacancy caused by the resignation of Prof. Walter Miller (Latin), University of Missouri, because of war service in France, the Committee has proposed Prof. Edward Capps to represent Princeton University and to replace the representative of Princeton University on the Council who is among those retiring this year.

"The eleven members of the Council as proposed are distributed as follows: five from Eastern institutions; six from the Middle West and Western institutions.

"The Committee has also drawn up a list of institutions having a considerable membership and which are not at present represented; and it is hoped that this list will be found useful for the Nominating Committee to be appointed to choose the officers for 1919."

NOTES FROM LOCAL BRANCHES

Brown—"The new officers of the local branch are: President, Prof. Henry B. Gardner; Secretary, Prof. A. C. Crowell; Third member of Executive Committee, Prof. A. DeF. Palmer.

"An item of Brown news that may be of interest to other universities, though the matter was not initiated by the Branch, is the act of the Corporation in appointing three of its members to serve on a Conference Committee and requesting the Faculty to select three of its members for this committee. This is intended to be a permanent committee."

University of Colorado—"Every man connected with the University, who is eligible, is a member."

Lafayette—"Officers elected, F. B. Peck, Chairman, J. W. Tupper, Secretary. Plans have been made for more or less regular meetings of the Branch, at which papers on various topics will be read and discussed.

"Each member of the Branch is in full sympathy with the spirit and purpose of the Association."

University of Missouri—"The question of the relation of the war to academic freedom was raised and discussed. It was decided to refer this matter to a special committee to report at a subsequent meeting which will be held in the near future. Another committee

was appointed to consider the question of coöperation with the Committee on Patriotic Service."

Mount Holyoke—"During the year 1917, the Branch has canvassed the Faculty with reference to membership in the Association, with the result that all the members of this Faculty who are now eligible, except two, have expressed a desire to join the Association and have been nominated by members of the Branch."

Smith—"The Smith College chapter has held four meetings during the year that is about to end. A simple constitution has been framed and adopted by the chapter. The officers are a President, J. S. Bassett; and a Secretary, Dr. Amy Louise Barbour. The president is to call special meetings when requested to do so by one-third of the members, or when he thinks necessary."

Leland Stanford Junior University—"Meetings were held during last year in connection with the Stanford Forum, a local organization for the purpose of discussing problems connected with the work of the Stanford Faculty."

NOTES FROM COMMITTEES

COMMITTEE A, ACADEMIC FREEDOM AND ACADEMIC TENURE.—

"Upon the recommendation of Committee A (Academic Freedom and Academic Tenure) the Executive Committee has authorized the appointment of a special committee to prepare a report upon the general subject of academic freedom in time of war. The special committee thus appointed comprises A. O. Lovejoy, Johns Hopkins; A. A. Young, Cornell; and Edward Capps, Princeton. The report will be submitted to the General Committee on Academic Freedom and Academic Tenure and then be presented at the annual meeting. The committee proposes to discuss both general principles and the recent dismissals at Columbia, Michigan, Minnesota and elsewhere."

The Committee on the Colorado College case comprises: E. H. Hollands, Kansas, *Chairman*; F. S. Deibler, Northwestern; George Lefevre, Missouri; John L. Lowes, Washington (St. Louis); H. A. Miller, Oberlin.

COMMITTEE R, ENCOURAGEMENT OF UNIVERSITY RESEARCH.—

"At the outset of its work the Committee endeavored to find out what was being done on the questions which it was to investigate. It appeared that two committees were already in existence. One, the sub-committee of the National Research Council on Research

in Educational Institutions has formed committees in various educational institutions; the object of each committee is the promotion of research in its own institution and the study of problems which the university may undertake on its own initiative or by request of the National Research Council. Many of these local committees have been formed and are actively at work. The second is the sub-committee on Research in Educational Institutions of the Committee of One Hundred of the American Association for the Advancement of Science. This committee has been mainly engaged in studying the relations of research to teaching and to other activities in educational institutions. A question paper has been sent out and a large amount of information, now in process of tabulation and condensation, has been obtained.

It seemed to be unnecessary that Committee R should duplicate the work of these two committees, which practically covered the whole field of its work. Committee R therefore agreed that it should not engage in further activities at the present time unless new problems arose which could be dealt with by it more efficiently than by the other existing committees."

E. W. Brown (Yale), Chairman.

COMMITTEE I, UNIVERSITY ETHICS.—The following matters have been submitted to the Committee on University Ethics for consideration. They are published in the hope that members of the Association may be moved to send to the Chairman of the Committee their opinions on any of the topics brought up. It is especially desirable to have full information from schools of law, medicine and engineering as to current practices with respect to extra-mural activities together with accounts of incidents which will illustrate the way in which these practices work out. In view of the somewhat general character of most of the questions it should be expressly understood that the Committee has not abandoned the hope that more specific cases based on concrete difficulties will be presented. Whenever desired, names of the institution and individual concerned will be kept confidential.

EXTRA-MURAL ACTIVITIES

Members of the faculty are requested to report to their respective deans any outside occupations which they may have, whether paid or unpaid, that the dean or in more important cases the provost may grant (or refuse) permission. This was interpreted *not* to include the writing of books or of articles for publication,

the delivery of occasional lectures, or incidental tutoring; it was intended to prevent members of the faculty from engaging to do work which would divert from the university a very considerable portion of their time and energy, although they were supposed to be giving their full time to that institution—unless of course, permission had been secured from the authorities of the institution.

An economist is asked to testify as an expert on taxation matters or on the valuation of public utilities. He is engaged by the government. Query: to what extent ought he to charge for his services? Or, secondly, he is engaged by a private corporation, which is prosecuting or defending a suit to which the government is the other party. To what extent ought the expert to take pay for services in a matter where, in his own individual judgment, the other party,—i. e. the government—is, broadly speaking, in the right? Or thirdly,—and this is an actual case that has happened—if he is asked for expert opinions on different aspects of the same matter by both parties—the government and the private corporation—to what extent is he justified in giving his opinions to both, and to what extent is he justified in demanding a compensation from either or both?

A medical professor, in most of our universities, is justified in pursuing his private practice. A legal professor, in many cases is justified in practicing law. Query: to what extent is a professor in the other professional faculties justified in earning money by doing work for individuals or corporations which may conceivably influence his views on topics which he is called upon to teach? Many instances of this, especially in cases where business or corporate action is opposed to what has come to be considered public policy, could easily be multiplied.

To what extent ought a university professor to allow his name to be used, and exploited, for purely business reasons, *e. g.* the Alexander Hamilton Institute?

What should be the relations of time given to original investigation, writing and extra-university lectures to a professor's class teaching?

OFFERS FROM OTHER INSTITUTIONS

The question is raised of using an offer from another university to improve one's financial status in the home university. The most flagrant cases are those in which the offer from outside is deliberately invited and is then presented to the home party "to be met" as the phrase goes, by an increased salary to retain the candidate. The more usual case is one in which the offer comes spontaneously—in which perhaps, there is a more or less sincere entertainment of the offer, but which in the end results in the declination and the advance in salary at home.

OWNERSHIP

The question of the ownership of apparatus; whether it should be vested in the laboratory or the individual who devises it. In connection with this a ruling in regard to patenting apparatus. Personally I believe we should not patent our laboratory devices; we should have the privilege of copyrighting our technical books, but should freely grant the right to republish any formulation of scientific laws.

TEMPORARY SUPPLY

There is also the question of temporary supply; I think there should be a distinct rule as to how far one should be called upon to fill a colleague's place in case of illness; for example, one might reasonably be asked to take charge of one course

for one month or two courses for two weeks; more than that might possibly be considered an imposition and our committee might make a declaration to this effect.

UNIVERSITY TITLES AND CONNECTIONS

It is desirable that there should be some definite understanding about the use of the name of the university with which a professor is connected or any department thereof. Should there be a definite understanding that no professor should use his title or the name of his institution in any connection not directly cognate to his scientific and educational activities? In addressing letters to the newspapers, signing petitions, etc., is it desirable that the name of the university should not be introduced either to identify the signer, or to give his mail address? The same question may be asked about petitions on all political or semi-political matters.

RELATIONS OF MEMBERS OF A FACULTY TO ONE ANOTHER

Is it professional ethics for members of a faculty to address criticisms of the actions of their colleagues to university authorities with a request that the criticized colleagues be disciplined when there is in existence a faculty committee for investigating and reporting upon breaches of academic propriety?

JOHN DEWEY,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE L, CO-OPERATION WITH LATIN-AMERICAN UNIVERSITIES.—*Supplement to Report of Committee L, submitted by the Chairman of the Committee, L. S. Rowe, University of Pennsylvania.* Since submitting the report of Committee L for publication in the October BULLETIN, I beg to add that word has been received from the following universities:

University of La Plata, La Plata, Argentine Republic. The National University of La Plata has received the proposals of the American Association of University Professors with much satisfaction, which proposals are now being considered by the Council of the University. The Council feels that, in view of the lofty purposes so earnestly sought, it is their duty to lend their aid toward the fulfilment of the plan. The University and its faculties are, therefore, ready to co-operate in so far as practicable.

University of San Marcos, Lima, Peru. The Rector of the University of San Marcos states that the University enthusiastically accepts the proposals submitted, but is prevented by lack of funds from co-operating at this time.

University of Cuzco, Cuzco, Peru. The Rector of the University states that the proposals submitted were accepted by the University with the understanding that the plans are in process of formation and may be subject to change. It is hoped, however, that it will be possible to put them into operation at as early an opportunity as possible.

University of Texas. The Executive Committee of the Board of Regents of the university has appropriated \$500 for the establishment of an exchange professorship with the universities of South America.

COMMITTEE T, PLACE AND FUNCTIONS OF FACULTIES.—The following members have been appointed to this committee to fill vacancies caused by the deaths of C. H. Johnston of Illinois and H. A. Sill, Cornell, and the resignations of S. F. MacLennan of Oberlin and G. E. Howard of Nebraska: B. H. Bode (Philosophy), Illinois; M. W. Sampson (English), Cornell; L. E. Lord (Latin), Oberlin; E. W. Davis (Mathematics), Nebraska. F. H. Dixon (Economics), Dartmouth, has been made a member of the committee since the publication of the list of members in the March BULLETIN.

COMMITTEE U, PATRIOTIC SERVICE.—Prof. C. H. Haskins (History), Harvard, has accepted the chairmanship of the committee. The names of the other members will be announced in the January BULLETIN.

Thus far the following committees have planned for meetings to be held at the Annual Meeting; A, E, J, O, P, and T. (See page 3.)

REPORT OF COMMITTEE J ON THE DISTINCTION BETWEEN THE SEVERAL HONORARY DEGREES AND THE BASIS FOR CONFERRING THEM

Your Committee has not considered the problem of the retention or abolition of honorary degrees, deeming it at once beyond the bounds of practical politics and the scope of the remit of the Association.

I

(1) Despite natural expectation to the contrary, a wide survey of degrees and of the procedure of institutions (American and foreign) conferring them, shows that:

(a) Unconscious agreement exists to some extent with regard to the meaning of the several degrees;

(b) It is evident that positive disapproval of recent and present methods of selection prevails at very few institutions. As a matter of fact, severe criticism emerges in one case alone;

(c) On the other hand, a general feeling, difficult to crystallize sharply, indicates the wisdom, if not the necessity, of certain changes in the *distribution* of the choice of recipients, in the expectation that better and *fewer* selections might result;

(d) There is agreement to the effect that the greatest difficulty, and the abuses, if any, arise when an institution confers honors on its own alumni or immediate constituency. The question mainly concerns "successful" alumni—successful in very different walks of life. It is not easy to find a degree adjustable to the various kinds of achievement, while the delicate relation of a college or university to its own children complicates the situation.

Further, it may be said with some confidence that, on the whole, too many *doctorates* are bestowed proportionately for practical or administrative success, too few upon representative leaders of scholarship, science, and technology. Moreover, all things considered, this disproportion is traceable with high likelihood to the constitution of the boards or committees upon whom the selection devolves.

Star-chamber methods are not so common as might be supposed, but the real importance of honorary degrees is too little considered,

—in any case, sufficient care and time are not always given to full deliberation. A contrast is traceable here between American and European institutions (notably the British universities, whose customs in conferring honorary degrees parallel our own much more closely than those of the Continent). Here again, the reason can be set down in all likelihood, to the *personnel* of the selectors.

II

Turning to the meaning of the several degrees. In a few instances this is evident on the face of it.

(1) D.C.L. (conferred seldom by the American institutions) is convertible with LL.D.

(2) D.D or S.T.D. is conferred upon ecclesiastical administrators or working pastors (85 of 89 degrees investigated). Denominations play a great part. Curiously enough, there is no honorary degree specifically attesting achievement in scientific theology. Possibly, it might be advisable for universities having a theological faculty and for the foremost theological seminaries to institute the D.Theol. for this purpose. But your Committee makes no recommendation.

(3) Mus.D., Math.D., Chem.D., Eng.D., and D.P.H. form a group by themselves. Their meaning is obvious; they are conferred rarely. Mus.D., Eng.D., and D.P.H. should never be conferred except by universities possessing the relevant faculty.

This leaves the degrees of LL.D., Litt.D. (or L.H.D.), Sc.D., A.M. and M.S.—the usual honors bestowed.

LL.D.

An analysis of 447 degrees, conferred by 37 institutions, serves to warrant two conclusions:

First, there is unconscious agreement in America and England that this is the suitable recognition of eminence or success in public life or administration. In the American lists, no less than 85 per cent of the total is contributed by public men, administrators, ecclesiastics, physicians and surgeons; scholars and investigators form but 8.06 per cent. Seeing that this degree is generally esteemed the highest *academic* honor, these figures indicate some lurking defect in methods of selection;

Second, however, the scholars or investigators who do receive the degree are always men of more than ordinary distinction and, as a rule, men of the highest eminence in their respective depart-

ments. At Oxford, the proportion of scholars and investigators who receive the D.C.L. is 19 per cent; this notwithstanding a distinct and growing convention to confer this degree upon statesmen, or great civil servants and other "empire makers"; and an equally distinct convention to provide for experts with the D.Litt. and D.Sc. Figures show that, compared with American institutions under consideration, Oxford confers the D.Litt. nearly $2\frac{1}{2}$ times more frequently, the D.Sc. just thrice as often. Thus much more ample provision is made for scholarly and scientific achievement. At the four Scottish universities the proportion of administrators, etc., falls to 23.6 per cent, while that of scholars, etc. rises to 49 per cent. However, comparison is complicated by the fact that the LL.D. is the sole distinction open to laymen. (An act of Parliament specifies that the specialist doctorates (D.Phil., D.Sc., and D.Litt.) must be earned).

Litt.D.

Unconscious agreement is more definite here. Of 89 degrees considered, 71 were bestowed upon scholars and investigators, 12 upon public men and administrators, 3 upon artists, 2 upon journalists, 1 upon a physician.

Sc.D.

Agreement here is overwhelming. Of 83 degrees, 64 were conferred upon investigators, 10 upon physicians and surgeons, 6 upon technicians, 2 upon architects.

A.M.

Mainly for the reasons stated above, this degree fails to indicate any consensus. Therefore, it is well to let the figures speak for themselves. The number reviewed was 44. They divide as follows: administrators, 11; public men, 7; physicians, 3; investigators, 3; journalists, 2; technician, 1; unclassified, 17, among them 7 women. None of these 17 appear in *Who's Who in America*. It may be noted, as a significant commentary upon the standing of the various recipients of the degrees that, in the case of LL.D., only two fail to appear in the American or British *Who's Who*; Litt.D., 2; Sc.D., 1; A.M., 17 of 44; D.D., 50 of 89. Comment is superfluous.

III

It is plain that the crux of the situation concerns the LL.D. and the A.M.

It is advisable, doubtless, that our institutions should enjoy means of recognizing public and administrative service. It is anomalous to say the least, that in one of our institutions generally accounted a great *university*, administrative officials should possess 12 honorary degrees while the entire staff of scholars and investigators (numbering some of the most eminent men in the world) should have just half this number: In other words, all is not well with the "fountain of honor." It is desirable, doubtless, that our institutions should recognize many kinds of merit in their own alumni; but they should have a care to use due deliberation.

IV

The following principles seem obvious:

- (1) Provision should be made for full and detailed deliberation on all proposed recipients of honorary degrees;
- (2) The committee of selection should be large enough to be representative, small enough to be workable;
- (3) As these degrees are *academic* honors, the expert staff should have a large, if not the main, determining weight;
- (4) Conditions at different institutions vary so much that any recommended plan should possess flexibility.

Your Committee is of opinion that the most stable method of selection is that in vogue at the Scottish universities. Here, on each of the two honorary degrees (LL.D. and D.D.) committees must be appointed by the senate (full professors) at the beginning of the academic year; these committees must report back, and their report must lie on the table for one month before final action be taken. Adapting these regulations to our conditions your Committee recommends:

- (1) That a committee on honorary degrees be appointed before Thanksgiving of each year;
- (2) That it consist of the President *ex officio*; of one or two members of the governing board *ex officiis*; and of not less than six members of the faculties;
- (3) That, in selecting the faculty members, care be taken to provide for regular rotation of representatives of different departments of investigation; the intent being that these should change from year to year;
- (4) That this committee keep a careful record so that continuity of action be safeguarded.

In the smaller institutions, it might be wise for the committee to report to the faculty as a whole; in the largest institutions this seems impracticable. Therefore, in all cases, publicity should be given within the institution to the *personnel* of the committee, which should be so selected as to enlist confidence.

This provides a definite plan, yet one elastic enough to admit alteration from institution to institution so as to meet local conditions.

Your Committee inclines to believe that, in the larger institutions at least, the committee on honorary degrees should appoint a sub-committee, not necessarily from its own membership, to deal with alumni, especially those who may be due to celebrate class anniversaries. In this regard, conditions at different institutions are so diverse that a single plan of procedure can not be suggested.

On the whole, if means be taken to safeguard the spirit of honorary degrees, by giving more time for deliberation and a great deal more *internal* publicity, a notable advance will have been made.

The Committee:

- R. B. BEAN, University of Virginia
- E. W. BOWEN, Randolph-Macon College
- J. W. BRIGHT, Johns Hopkins University
- FLORIAN CAJORI, Colorado College
- J. V. DENNEY, Ohio State University
- C. W. HARGITT, Syracuse University
- H. W. HARPER, University of Texas
- G. E. HOWARD, University of Nebraska
- CARL KELSEY, University of Pennsylvania
- ELIZABETH LAIRD, Mt. Holyoke College
- E. P. LEWIS, University of California
- O. G. LIBBY, University of North Dakota
- H. C. METCALF, Tufts College
- A. K. POTTER, Brown University
- H. S. RICHARDS, University of Wisconsin
- M. J. ROSENAU, Harvard University
- F. SCHLESINGER, University of Pittsburgh
- A. N. TALBOT, University of Illinois
- C. T. WINCHESTER, Wesleyan University
- J. A. WOODBURN, Indiana University
- R. M. WENLEY, University of Michigan, *Chairman.*

ACADEMIC FREEDOM AND ACADEMIC TENURE

REPORT ON CONDITIONS AT ALLEGHENY COLLEGE

The sub-committee whose report is presented herewith was appointed to investigate and report upon the case of Professor Frank C. Lockwood of Allegheny College, Meadville, Pennsylvania. The sub-committee made a careful study of Professor Lockwood's case; but certain changes in the situation, explained in the report, brought the sub-committee to the opinion that it could be of greater service by co-operating with the administration of Allegheny College in obtaining permanently improved conditions of academic tenure at that College. In so doing the sub-committee did not find against the contentions of those who asked for an investigation of Professor Lockwood's case, nor did it condone any infringements of proper standards of academic tenure, if such there were, that may have been chargeable to Allegheny College in the past. The sub-committee's procedure has our full endorsement.

COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC FREEDOM AND ACADEMIC TENURE,
Allyn A. Young, Chairman.

REPORT OF THE SUB-COMMITTEE

Allegheny College, though organized on a non-denominational basis, is historically associated with the Methodist Church, from which it receives some support. About one third of its trustees are nominated by Methodist conferences and a majority of its faculty are members of the same church.

Early in 1916 a controversy in which the case of Professor Lockwood was most prominent was brought to the attention of this Association and a committee of inquiry was appointed. A large number of documents and letters were laid before this committee, which also entered into correspondence with representatives of the administration, faculty, alumni, and others. During the Thanksgiving (1916) recess, the chairman of the committee spent two days at Meadville. Interviews were had with all the professors except one who was out of the city, and also with a number of citizens.

At Pittsburgh several days later a half day's conference was held with President Wm. H. Crawford, the committee being represented by Professor M. A. Rosanoff and the chairman. The following report is subscribed to by the entire committee:

Professor Frank C. Lockwood held the chair of English Language and Literature from 1902 until June, 1916, when he resigned to take a similar position in the University of Arizona. It was Professor Lockwood's belief (generally acknowledged to be correct) that he would otherwise have been dropped one year later under a newly adopted rule limiting the tenure of professors to five-year periods.

Professor Lockwood's resignation forestalled any possible adverse action on the part of the college trustees. There is in fact no official act in which his name is mentioned between his appointment in 1902 and the acceptance of his resignation in 1916. In view of this fact and in view of the further fact that conditions of professorial tenure have been substantially changed since this occurrence, the committee understands that its proper concern is chiefly with general conditions and regulations. It is not therefore necessary to recount here in detail or to analyze the difficulties between Professor Lockwood and the administration. The nature of the controversy may be suggested by the mention of two concrete facts which have been discussed widely and with much feeling, though it is uncertain to what extent they represent the fundamental causes of estrangement and to what extent this estrangement was the result of incompatibility of temper and ideals. From thus practically confining the report to general policies it is not to be understood that the committee is virtually rendering an adverse judgment against Professor Lockwood. The committee found no reason for such an adverse judgment.

Professor Lockwood's ardent leadership in the cause of Prohibition brought him into conflict with the two resident members of the Executive Committee of the Board of Trustees, who are attorneys and as such represented applicants for liquor licenses in Meadville. There were also other political clashes in which Professor Lockwood was pitted against resident members of the board. In 1914 he was candidate for Congress on the Washington party ticket (official name of the Progressive party in Pennsylvania) and also on the Prohibition ticket.

In the spring of 1915 when relations were already strained, Pro-

fessor Lockwood's wife united with the local Unitarian Church, while he himself continued in good standing as a minister in the Methodist Church. Mrs. Lockwood's right to join the Unitarian Church was not questioned, but feeling concerning the matter became very bitter and gave rise to controversy which further strained relations.

Of the general conditions and rules complained of, one was a resolution adopted by the Board of Trustees in January, 1916, which was as follows: "We, the Board of Trustees of Allegheny College, record our judgment that it is prejudicial to the interests of the College for its professors or teachers to participate actively in politics by becoming candidates for public office, state or nation, and we request that while in the employment of the College they will not so engage." The question here involved, namely, the proper measure of political activity on the part of professors, has been, and presumably still is, under consideration by a general committee of this Association. Therefore, until the Association has passed upon that principle or withdrawn it from the general committee, the sub-committee does not feel that it can do more than record the facts in the case.

The other general ruling coming within the scope of this committee's inquiries relates to professorial tenures. Previous to the year 1913 all professors, while nominally subject to annual appointment, were practically enjoying indefinite tenure. This was changed, making all professorial tenures five years. It was under this new rule that Professor Lockwood expected to be dropped.

President Crawford in his first letter to the chairman of this committee (October, 1916), stated that the abrogation of the five-year rule was being considered. At the meeting of the Board of Trustees in January, 1917, the following action was taken:

In view of the fact that the term appointment plan adopted by the Board of Trustees of Allegheny College on January 9, 1913, has not accomplished in all ways what was anticipated, the following modifications are hereby made to take effect at the opening of the scholastic year 1917-18:

Appointment to an instructorship shall be made for one year only as heretofore; an assistant professor may be appointed for one, two or three years; a full professor may be appointed for a term of two, three or five years, but after he has proved his ability during a term of not to exceed five years of professorial work he shall then be appointed indefinitely, *i. e.*, at the pleasure of the

trustees, with the understanding that a professor so appointed shall not be dismissed except for cause.

At the meeting of the same board June 2, 1917, this section was supplemented by the following:

If at any time it shall seem desirable to dismiss a member of the faculty serving under indefinite appointment, no action will be taken by the trustees until after such professor shall have had full hearing before a committee consisting of two trustees, two professors, and the president of the board of directors of the alumni association or someone he may appoint, and after a report of its conclusions has been made by this committee to the trustees.

This committee raised some question concerning the interpretation of the word "desirable" in the first line of the last resolution, suggesting that it be interpreted as meaning "necessary for the good of the institution." There was also a question as to the method of choosing the two professors on the proposed hearing committee. In answer to these questions President Crawford states in a letter to the chairman dated June 16, 1917, "Our understanding of the matter was exactly the same as yours, both as to the interpretation of the word 'desirable' and also as to the representative character of the members of the faculty." In a letter of the same date to Professor Allyn A. Young, chairman of the standing committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure, President Crawford says: "The intent, both of our committee and of the trustees, is that the two trustees shall be appointed by the Board of Trustees and the two professors by the faculty. I am positive of the meaning, for the question was raised in the trustee meeting."

It is the opinion of this committee that these resolutions are fair to the professors of Allegheny College and in harmony with the principles for which this Association stands.

BENJAMIN P. BOURLAND, Western Reserve University.

J. A. LEIGHTON, Ohio State University.

M. A. ROSANOFF, University of Pittsburgh.

NEVIN FENNEMAN, University of Cincinnati, *Chairman*.

SECRETARY'S REPORT

During the current year the work of this office has consisted mainly of the editorial conduct of the BULLETIN, the management by mail of the business of the Council and Executive Committee, the care of nominations and elections to membership and correspondence with local branches and committees.

The chief items of Council and Executive Committee business have already been stated in the present or previous issues of the BULLETIN. It may be noted that the Executive Committee has held one meeting and has appointed new committees as follows: R, Encouragement of Research; S, Organization of Summer Schools; T, Place and Functions of Faculties; U, Patriotic Service.

The present BULLETIN, completing Vol. IV, makes the first full volume thus far published, as stated monthly BULLETINS began to be issued only in March, 1916.

The statistics of membership are as follows: January 1, 1917, active members, 1,915, honorary members, 16; January 1 to November 30, 1917, elected to membership, 279; membership resigned, 28, deaths, 10, membership lapsed by non-payment of dues, 14; membership November 30, 1917, active, 2,133, honorary, 25, gain in active membership during the year, 218.

During the year the Secretary has circulated to members of the Council and to local branches a list of institutions eligible under our rules, but having no representatives in our membership. This list at present numbers 100 institutions. The list has been reduced by thirty-three during the year and further efforts in that direction are still in progress.

The procedure of the Committee on Admissions has been developed during the year by correspondence between Chairman Dealey and the Secretary. The present nomination card should probably be revised in the near future in order that certain details will less frequently be omitted. It has seemed undesirable to make frequent changes, however, in a blank of this character. A four-page circular of general information has been issued and its circulation among persons eligible for membership has undoubtedly promoted the growth in numbers we have experienced during the year.

FINANCIAL.—The considerable deficit at the end of last year, which was fortunately covered by the generosity of members, caused the Executive Committee to plan this year's business with some apprehension and a strong desire to avoid repetition of the difficulty. In spite of the increased cost of printing, it seems that we are now living within our income, and that with a normal growth in membership, somewhat greater liberality may be exercised in future appropriations for committee work.

In connection with the work of local branches, the question has been raised as to whether, under a moderate increase of the general dues of the Association, it might not be feasible to make a small allowance for incidental expenses of the local branches in view of the inconvenience of collecting small local assessments directly.

A society maintaining a monthly bulletin and charging only \$2 for annual dues can naturally not afford a system of repeated notification for payment of dues, by correspondence. By agreement with the Treasurer, with the approval of the Executive Committee, the following plan has been put into effect: Members whose dues for the current year remain unpaid June 1 are notified that in the absence of payment the *BULLETIN* will be discontinued. Members more than one year in arrears are notified that in the absence of payment their names will be dropped from the roll. Some of the questions that have arisen in this connection during the year are undoubtedly due to the disturbance of war conditions. The labor of the Treasurer and the Secretary in carrying on their work would be much lightened if all members would pay the modest dues at the beginning of the year.

H. W. TYLER,
Secretary.

MEMBERSHIP

NOMINATIONS FOR MEMBERSHIP

The nomination on page 39 of the November BULLETIN of George Tyler Norton should have read George Tyler Northup (Romance Languages), Chicago.

The following seventeen nominations are printed as provided under Article IV of the Constitution. Objection to any nominee may be addressed to the Secretary, H. W. Tyler, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, Mass., or to the Chairman of the Committee on Admissions,* and will be considered by the Committee if received before February 15, 1918.

The Committee on Admissions* consists of J. Q. Dealey (Brown), Chairman; Florence Bascom (Bryn Mawr), Edward Capps (Princeton), J. V. Denney (Ohio State), A. R. Hohlfeld (Wisconsin), G. H. Marx (Stanford), and F. C. Woodward (Washington, D. C.).

The names of nominators follow the name of each nominee in parentheses. Nominators for whom no institution is specified are colleagues of the nominee.

- Arthur Adams (English), Trinity (Conn.),
(Charles H. Whitman, Edwin B. Davis and Louis Bevier, Rutgers)
- Franz Boas (Anthropology), Columbia,
(A. O. Lovejoy, Johns Hopkins, John Dewey, Richard Gottheil)
- George Henry Chase (Archeology), Harvard,
(C. H. Moore, W. B. Munro, J. D. M. Ford)
- John D. Clark, (Chemistry) New Mexico,
(E. C. Franklin, W. H. Sloan and R. E. Swain, Stanford)
- George L. Coyle (Chemistry), Holy Cross,
(H. P. Talbot, R. S. Williams and F. J. Moore, Mass. Inst. Tech.)
- Albert B. Dinwiddie (Mathematics), Virginia,
(E. A. Bechtel, Irving Hardesty and Susan D. Tew, Tulane)
- Roland B. Dixon (Anthropology), Harvard,
(C. H. Moore, W. B. Munro, J. D. M. Ford)
- Robert Dale Ford (Mathematics), St. Lawrence,
(E. B. Wilson, Mass. Inst. Tech., L. M. Salmon and H. S. White, Vassar)
- Lawrence J. Henderson (Chemistry), Harvard,
(C. H. Moore, C. H. C. Wright, J. D. M. Ford)
- Benjamin Franklin Lutman (Plant Pathology), Vermont,
(E. C. Jacobs, S. F. Emerson, S. E. Bassett)

* Nominations should in all cases be presented through the Secretary, H. W. Tyler, Mass. Institute of Technology, Cambridge, Mass.

- David G. Lyon (Semitic Languages), Harvard,
(C. H. Moore, W. B. Munro, J. D. M. Ford)
- L. B. Mitchell (Latin), New Mexico,
(E. C. Franklin, W. H. Sloan and R. E. Swain, Stanford)
- H. F. Perkins (Zoölogy), Vermont,
(S. F. Emerson, A. B. Myrick, S. E. Bassett)
- John X. Pyne (Metaphysics), Holy Cross,
(H. P. Talbot, F. J. Moore and H. W. Tyler, Mass. Inst. Tech.)
- James H. Ropes (Theology), Harvard,
(C. H. Moore, W. B. Munro, J. D. M. Ford)
- L. B. Schmidt (History), Iowa State,
(G. A. Chaney, W. F. Coover, L. H. Pammel)
- Elijah Swift (Mathematics), Vermont,
(A. B. Myrick, E. C. Jacobs, S. E. Bassett)

TREASURER'S STATEMENT

Cash on hand December 27, 1916.....	\$109.97	
Contributions toward 1916 deficit.....	1,050.55	
1916 bills paid.....		\$1,035.99
Balance from 1916.....		124.53
	<hr/>	<hr/>
	\$1,160.52	\$1,160.52

RECEIPTS AND DISBURSEMENTS ON 1917 ACCOUNT

Balance from 1916.....	\$124.53	
Dues.....	4,200.35	
BULLETIN sales.....	82.36	
Interest.....	30.29	
BULLETIN (Jan. 1 to Oct. 31, six issues).....		\$1,244.61
Secretary's office (Jan. 1 to Oct. 31).....		458.64
Assistant secretary (Jan. 1 to Oct. 31).....		416.60
Treasurer's office (Jan. 1 to Oct. 31).....		107.12
President's office (Jan. 1 to Oct. 31).....		28.38
Committee A (Jan. 1 to Oct. 31).....		87.40
Committee A reports (less special sales).....		656.21
Other committees (Jan. 1 to Oct. 31).....		102.48
		<hr/>
		\$3,101.44
Dues refunded.....		6.00
Cash on hand, Nov. 30, 1917.....		1,330.09
	<hr/>	<hr/>
	\$4,937.53	\$4,937.53
Bills unpaid November 30, \$366.19		
Dues outstanding, \$264.00		

THE [illegible] OF [illegible]

BY [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

